

Package of Diamonds<sup>2</sup>.



Rev. R. F. Walcott.  
21 Cornhill.  
Boston.  
Mass.



ms. B.1.6 v.4. p.33



Portsmouth, July 30, 1851.

My dear Sir,

When your letter with its enclosure arrived at Portsmouth I was absent on a journey, & now for the first time find leisure since my return find leisure for a reply.

In the first place, my responsibility for the Register is necessarily very limited, as the editors make up each week's paper on Monday morning, & I am with them but hardly one Monday in six. With reference to the smaller subject-matter of your communication, I had not the opportunity of joining in consultation or expressing an opinion, until the 14<sup>th</sup> inst., when Mr. Morison & I read together the article from Mr. May, which you have sent me. I will now state to you, & through him to you, precisely the ground on which we declined publishing it.

The remark was made by Mr. Morison at the outset, & assented to by myself, "Well!



here is an explanation from Mr. May, -  
we are bound to print it of course, though  
I wish it were shorter." When we had  
finished reading it, it was said, "Between  
ourselves," "In kindness to Mr. May we  
must suppress this; for it places him in  
a ~~so~~ worse position than he occupied  
before". The two points of Mr. May's  
accusation, which we ~~regarded as~~  
knew to be false & felt to be severely  
unkind, were, 1. that the Janus-faced aspect  
of the number of the Register in question was  
designed to produce one impression in the  
country & another in the city, & ~~sec 2~~, that  
there was influence from without  
employed in effecting that arrangement.  
Both these statements are without  
authority, & unqualifiedly false, though  
Mr. May, I find, still adheres to the  
latter, & a near kinsman of his has  
with reference to the latter been exceedingly  
overbearing & insolent in his inquiries, demands  
& allegations, addressed ~~to~~ to the Publisher of the



paper. We regard Mr. ~~A~~ Parkman's letter, as by no means sustaining Mr. May's statements, but the contrary. We believe that, if we wanted to place Mr. May before our readers as a wanton & libeller, (which we do not,) the true way would be to publish his communication with Mr. Parkman's letter; & of course we could not publish one without the other.

Now, I believe that our judgment is to be more relied upon than yours. Mr. Wmison & myself are well fitted to look at the whole matter dispassionately. We were both off of us off duty, one by reason of sickness, the other of distance, at the time that the peccant article was written. We should neither of us have objected to it, or even assented to its withdrawal, unless it had been to replace Mr. Foster's prayer by some equally strong statement of our own addressed manward. We both both of us have the kindest feelings towards



Mr. May; & ~~to~~ wish to save his reputation  
for veracity & honor. We do not suppose  
that he has willingly uttered falsehood;  
but we do know that he has given currency  
to injurious falsehood; & he will do himself  
double injury by insulting on the publi-  
cation of authority to which he has  
appealed, but which cannot sustain him  
except in the view of those who are  
determined to believe without or against  
evidence whatever is discreditable to person  
out of their own clique.

I thus have given you in great  
haste our view of the case as it  
stands. On the Monday after next, I shall  
be in Boston, & will take with me  
to the Editors' meeting the article which  
you have sent me for a fresh consulta-  
tion, after which, if we still conclude  
not to publish it, we will return it  
to your address,

I am, Sir, Yours truly,

A. P. Peabody.